

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/931,065	NOBE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	M. A. Sager	3714	

**All Participants:**

(1) M. A. Sager.

(2) A. Kasper (25426).

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 18 May 2004

**Time:** 9:30 and 10:15

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**  
 102 rejection

**Claims discussed:**  
 3, 11, 14

**Prior art documents discussed:**  
 Sagawa (6379244) , Suzuki (6227968)i

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**  
 See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Counsel requested interview to assert final was premature based on holding being improper. Examiner noted scope of amended claim 3 (paper rec'd Jan 23, 2004) was not identical/same scope as which patentability being asserted in that language asserted as being patentable was not included in amended claim 3. Exr invited Counsel to review file at his leisure to view filed amendment. In subsequent telephone discussion on same day, Counsel contacted examiner to request examiner's amendment to add language to claim 3 as that which was added to end of claim 1 and to delete 'process' from preamble for each claim 3, 11 and 14. Counsel noted that US 6227968 is the US national application of JP 2000-37491 and that corresponding US patent had been indicated as having been reviewed/considered.